

Partial Observations, Einstein Locality and Bell Inequalities in Quantized Detector Networks

George Jaroszkiewicz

School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Nottingham,
University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, UK

Abstract. Quantized detector networks (QDN) deals with quantum information exchange between observers and their apparatus rather than with systems under observation. Partial observations in QDN involve subsets of the elementary signal detectors which constitute an apparatus. We use them to prove that QDN is consistent with Einstein locality and violations of Bell-type inequalities.

PACS numbers: 03.65.-w, 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Ud

1. Introduction

QDN (quantized detector networks) [1] is an approach to the description of quantum experiments which emphasizes the role of observer and apparatus, rather than the properties of any imagined SUO (system under observation). QDN is based on the core principles underpinning Heisenberg's approach to QM (quantum mechanics) [2, 3] and asserts that the only physically relevant quantities in quantum physics are signals from apparatus.

Non-locality has always been a fundamental issue in QM and is the source of various apparent paradoxes, such as wave-particle duality and the super-luminal transmission of certain types of information [4]. QDN interprets quantum non-locality as originating from the fact that apparatus is invariably non-local, as are the processes of extracting information from it, rather than reflecting strange, non-classical properties of SUOs.

There is a fundamental constraint on all quantum theories, known as *Einstein locality* or the principle of local causes [5]. This principle asserts that “*events occurring in a given spacetime region are independent of external parameters that may be controlled, at the same moment, by agents located in distant spacetime regions*” [5]. The aim of this paper is to demonstrate that QDN indeed provides a consistent, physically correct account of quantum physics, capable of satisfying Einstein locality on the one hand and the demands of quantum non-locality, such as is seen in violations of Bell-type inequalities, on the other.

The plan of this paper is as follows. In §2 we briefly review the core formalism of QDN. In §3 we discuss labstates and maximal questions, generalizing the latter in §4 to the notion of *partial questions*, which is central to this paper. In §5 we discuss local operations on apparatus and show how Einstein locality can be encoded into QDN. In §6, we apply these ideas to a QDN discussion of local spatial rotations of quantization axes in Stern-Gerlach experiments. This prepares the ground for a discussion in §7 of EPR spin-pair experiments and Bell-type inequalities. Finally, in §8, we discuss the implication of these ideas.

2. QDN basics

In QDN, time is measured in terms of quantum information exchange between observer and apparatus and is discrete on that account. At any given time n , the observer's apparatus $\mathcal{A}_n$ consists of a finite number r_n of ESDs (elementary signal detectors), each of which is represented by a corresponding single signal qubit. In a classical approach, $\mathcal{A}_n$ would be represented by the Cartesian product of all the signal bits, but in order to reflect quantum properties such as superposition and entanglement, $\mathcal{A}_n$ is represented by a quantum register $\mathcal{R}_n \equiv \mathcal{Q}_n^1 \otimes \mathcal{Q}_n^2 \otimes \dots \mathcal{Q}_n^{r_n}$, the tensor product of all the signal qubits at that time. Such a register, together with the contextual information as to what each signal qubit means, is called a *Heisenberg net*. Even if the rank r_n remains constant in time, an observer's Heisenberg net changes at each time step: $\mathcal{R}_{n+1}$ is always

distinct from $\mathcal{R}_n$.

In QDN, the observer calculates quantum outcome probabilities not via quantum states of SUOs but via quantum states of their apparatus, which are referred to as *labstates*. A labstate at time n is denoted by $|\Psi, n\rangle$ and is a normalized element of $\mathcal{R}_n$. Labstates can be separable or entangled, but apparatus itself is not entangled normally (although that possibility may exist but this cannot be discussed here).

In QDN, observations are answers to questions asked by observers of their apparatus, and we shall use the two terms, *observation* and *question*, to mean the same thing. A *maximal question* is one involving all the ESDs in a given Heisenberg net, which invariably implies that such an observation is a non-local operation. However, what is possible in principle and in practice is that an observer could decide to look at only a subset of the ESDs available to them at a given time, and then such an observation is called a *partial observation*.

In order to discuss partial observations, we first need to understand how labstates are described. The two most useful representations of a current labstate $|\Psi, n\rangle$ are in terms of the computational basis $\mathbf{B}_n \equiv \{|i, n\rangle : i = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, 2^{r_n} - 1\}$ and via the signal operators $\{\mathbb{A}_{i,n}^+ : i = 1, 2, \dots, r_n\}$ and their adjoints. The computational basis is useful for mathematical calculations whilst the signal operators are directly tied in with the intuitive physics of the situation.

Given a rank- r quantum register $\mathcal{R}^r \equiv \mathcal{Q}^1 \otimes \mathcal{Q}^2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{Q}^r$, there are r signal creation operators $\mathbb{A}_i^+ : i = 1, 2, \dots, r$, each of which has a corresponding signal destruction operator $\mathbb{A}_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, r$. These operators are constructed from tensor products of various individual signal qubit operators, as discussed in detail in [1].

In QDN, there is no concept of ground state. Instead, the nearest equivalent to it is the *void* state, or information vacuum, which represents an apparatus in its quiescent state, i.e., one such that none of its constituent ESDs would be in its signal (i.e., fired) state if examined by the observer. The signal destruction operators annihilate the void state $|0\rangle$, i.e., $\mathbb{A}_i|0\rangle = 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ whilst the signal creation operators create signal states, i.e., $\mathbb{A}_i^+|0\rangle = |2^{i-1}\rangle$, $\mathbb{A}_i^+\mathbb{A}_j^+|0\rangle = |2^{i-1} + 2^{j-1}\rangle, i \neq j$, etc., using the computational basis representation.

If $\mathbb{I}^r$ denotes the identity operator for $\mathcal{R}^r$ then the signal operators satisfy the *signal algebra*

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{A}_i\} &= \{\mathbb{A}_i^+, \mathbb{A}_i^+\} = 0, & \{\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{A}_i\} &= \mathbb{I}^r, & i &= 1, 2, \dots, r, \\ [\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{A}_j] &= [\mathbb{A}_i, \mathbb{A}_j^+] = 0, & i &\neq j, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where square brackets denote commutators and curly brackets denote anticommutators. We refer to the above as *quadratic relations*, as they involve products of two signal operators. The signal algebra (1) is based on the physics of quantum observation, i.e., on what happens in the laboratory, and is unique on that account.

It is convenient to define corresponding elementary projection operators (EPOs). We define $\mathbb{P}_i \equiv \mathbb{A}_i^+\mathbb{A}_i$, $\overline{\mathbb{P}}_i \equiv \mathbb{A}_i\mathbb{A}_i^+, i = 1, 2, \dots, r$. These operators satisfy the quadratic

relations

$$\mathbb{P}_i + \bar{\mathbb{P}}_i = \mathbb{I}^r, \quad \mathbb{P}_i|0\rangle = 0, \quad \langle 0|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_i = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, r, \quad (2)$$

the *cubic relations*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_i \mathbb{A}_i &= \mathbb{A}_i^+ \mathbb{P}_i = \bar{\mathbb{P}}_i \mathbb{A}_i^+ = \mathbb{A}_i \bar{\mathbb{P}}_i = 0, \\ \mathbb{P}_i \mathbb{A}_i^+ &= \mathbb{A}_i^+ \bar{\mathbb{P}}_i = \mathbb{A}_i^+, \quad \mathbb{A}_i \mathbb{P}_i = \bar{\mathbb{P}}_i \mathbb{A}_i = \mathbb{A}_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, r, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

and the *quartic relations*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_i \mathbb{P}_i &= \mathbb{P}_i, \quad \bar{\mathbb{P}}_i \bar{\mathbb{P}}_i = \bar{\mathbb{P}}_i, \quad \mathbb{P}_i \bar{\mathbb{P}}_i = \bar{\mathbb{P}}_i \mathbb{P}_i = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, r, \\ [\mathbb{P}_i, \mathbb{P}_j] &= [\mathbb{P}_i, \bar{\mathbb{P}}_j] = [\bar{\mathbb{P}}_i, \bar{\mathbb{P}}_j] = 0, \quad i \neq j. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

3. Labstates and maximal questions

In this section, dependence on the temporal index n is suppressed. Given a rank- r Heisenberg net, a pure labstate $|\Psi\rangle$ is of the general form

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle &= \Psi_0|0\rangle + \sum_{i=1}^r \Psi_i \mathbb{A}_i^+ |0\rangle + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq r} \Psi_{ij} \mathbb{A}_i^+ \mathbb{A}_j^+ |0\rangle + \\ &\quad \dots + \Psi_{12\dots r} \mathbb{A}_1^+ \mathbb{A}_2^+ \dots \mathbb{A}_r^+ |0\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Labstates are generally normalized to unity, so the coefficients satisfy the condition

$$(\Psi, \Psi) = |\Psi_0|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^r |\Psi_i|^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq r} |\Psi_{ij}|^2 + \dots + |\Psi_{12\dots r}|^2 = 1. \quad (6)$$

For example, an arbitrary labstate for a rank-2 Heisenberg net is of the form

$$|\Psi\rangle = \{\Psi_0 + \Psi_1 \mathbb{A}_1^+ + \Psi_2 \mathbb{A}_2^+ + \Psi_{12} \mathbb{A}_1^+ \mathbb{A}_2^+\} |0\rangle, \quad (7)$$

with $|\Psi_0|^2 + |\Psi_1|^2 + |\Psi_2|^2 + |\Psi_{12}|^2 = 1$. The interpretation of these coefficients is based on the Born rule in standard quantum mechanics (SQM) [6]: if the apparatus is in labstate (7) prior to the observer looking at both ESDs “simultaneously” (which is possible in QDN by definition), then the probability of each ESDs being found in its void state is $|\Psi_0|^2$, the probability of ESD₁ being in its fired state *and* ESD₂ being in its void state is $|\Psi_1|^2$, the probability of ESD₁ being in its void state *and* ESD₂ being in its fired state is $|\Psi_2|^2$, and the probability of both ESDs being in their fired states is $|\Psi_{12}|^2$.

We introduce the following notation to encode the above ideas. Suppose the observer looked at the i^{th} ESD, $\mathcal{E}_i$, and obtained the answer to the basic signal question *What is the signal state of this detector?* If the answer is “void”, i.e., no signal, then we write $s_i = 0$. Otherwise, if the answer is “fired”, i.e., there is a signal, then we write $s_i = 1$. What was expressed in words in the preceding paragraph can now be expressed in terms of conditional probabilities. For example, $P(\{s_1 = 1\} \& \{s_2 = 0\} | \Psi) = |\Psi_1|^2$, and so on. A further simplification is to express the various propositions symbolically. We write $S_i \equiv \{s_i = 1\}$, $\bar{S}_i \equiv \{s_i = 0\}$ and denote conjunctions such as $\{s_i = 1\} \& \{s_j = 0\}$ by $S_i \bar{S}_j$, etc. Then for example we write $P(\{s_1 = 0\} \& \{s_2 = 0\} | \Psi) \equiv P(S_1 \bar{S}_2) = |\Psi_0|^2$,

and so on. We may use the properties of the projection operators given above to relate answers to all these questions to expectation values of products of EPOs. For example, for the rank-2 apparatus discussed above, we have four maximal questions and answers, such as $P(S_1\bar{S}_2|\Psi) \equiv (\Psi|\mathbb{P}_1\bar{\mathbb{P}}_2|\Psi) = |\Psi_1|^2$, etc.

4. Partial questions

The above probabilities represent answers to maximal questions, i.e., questions which are asked of each and every ESD in the Heisenberg net at a given time. For a rank- r Heisenberg net, any maximal question involves a product of r distinct EPOs. For each ESD, $\mathcal{E}_i$, there are two related EPOs, $\mathbb{P}_i$ and $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_i$, which form a *conjugate pair*. Therefore there are exactly 2^r distinct maximal questions.

In the real world, however, observers could choose to ask *partial questions*, which involve looking at only some (or even none) of the ESDs. An extreme example of a partial question is the normalization condition $(\Psi|\Psi) = 1$. This is equivalent to asking for the probability of finding anything at all, including no signals, without bothering to look. This probability is obviously unity, conditional on the apparatus existing in the first place and on a normalized labstate having been prepared.

It will be clear from the above that the set of all partial questions involves expectation values of all possible products of the projection operators. For the rank-2 example discussed above, there are four non-trivial partial questions, such as $P(S_1|\Psi) \equiv (\Psi|\mathbb{P}_1|\Psi) = |\Psi_1|^2 + |\Psi_{12}|^2$, etc. Trivial partial questions are those for which the answer is always zero. For example, the answer to the question *What is the probability of ESD $\mathcal{E}_i$ being in its void state and in its signal state?* is given by $P(\bar{S}_i S_i|\Psi) \equiv (\Psi|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_i \mathbb{P}_i|\Psi) = 0$, which arises from the property that $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_i \mathbb{P}_i = 0$ for each i .

5. Local operations

In this section, we discuss a physical operation U_p on a rank- r apparatus $\mathcal{A}_r$ which affects a number p of the ESDs in $\mathcal{A}_r$ and leaves the remaining $q \equiv r - p$ unaffected. The affected ESDs and their corresponding signal qubits will be called *local* whilst the unaffected ESDs and their corresponding signal qubits will be called *remote*. By unaffected, we mean that no possible partial measurements on the remote ESDs alone would detect any changes, given that U_p had been implemented[‡].

The approach we take is to split the original register $\mathcal{R}^r$ into two sub-registers $\mathcal{R}^p$ and $\mathcal{R}^q$, such that $\mathcal{R}^r = \mathcal{R}^p \otimes \mathcal{R}^q$. $\mathcal{R}^p$ is the tensor product $\mathcal{Q}^1 \otimes \mathcal{Q}^2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{Q}^p$ of the local signal qubits whilst $\mathcal{R}^q$ is the tensor product $\mathcal{Q}^{p+1} \otimes \mathcal{Q}^{p+2} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{Q}^r$ of the remote signal qubits. Each of these subregisters comes with its own natural preferred basis $\mathbf{B}_p \equiv \{|i\rangle_p : i = 0, 1, \dots, 2^p - 1\}$ and $\mathbf{B}_q \equiv \{|a\rangle_q : a = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 2^q - 1\}$ respectively. We

[‡] Note that the language here is imprecise. Experiments to detect changes in the remote ESDs would actually involve ensembles of runs, comparing partial measurements on apparatus evolving without the action of U_p with partial measurements on apparatus evolving with it.

write $|i\rangle_p \otimes |a\rangle_q \equiv |i, a\rangle$, an element of $\mathbf{B}_r$, the natural basis for $\mathcal{R}^r$. Then orthonormality of the elements of $\mathbf{B}_r$ gives the rule $(i, a|j, b) = \delta_{ij}\delta_{ab}$.

The operation U_p will be assumed here to leave the rank of the local qubits unchanged, but in principle it is possible to consider changes in rank. Such scenarios occur in particle decay experiments, for example, in which case the rank increases monotonically with time [7]. It is also possible to consider reduction in rank, such as occurs when apparatus is destroyed, or when some ESDs are observed in order to transmit classical information, such as occurs in teleportation experiments. In such cases, the operators involved cannot be semi-unitary and non-linear quantum mechanics is involved.

In our case, the action of U_p will be represented by some semi-unitary operator $\mathbb{U}_p$ acting on $\mathcal{R}^r$, taking it into a copy $\mathcal{R}'^r$. Primes will denote objects such as ESDs, signal qubits, EPOs and labstates **after** the action of U_p . To avoid possible confusion, we write $|i, a\rangle' \equiv |\overline{i, a}\rangle$.

With these points in mind, then the most general local operation satisfying these conditions has the following action on the natural basis elements of $\mathcal{R}^r$:

$$\mathbb{U}_p|i, a\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{2^p-1} U_p^{ji}|\overline{j, a}\rangle, \quad 0 \leq i < 2^p, \quad 0 \leq a < 2^q, \quad (8)$$

where the coefficients $\{U_p^{ji}\}$ are complex-valued functions of the externally controlled parameters mentioned in the statement of the principle of local causes in the introduction. These coefficients satisfy the semi-unitarity relations

$$\sum_{j=0}^{2^p-1} [U_p^{ji}]^* U_p^{jk} = \delta_{ik}. \quad (9)$$

From completeness of the basis set $\{|i, a\rangle\}$ we deduce

$$\mathbb{U}_p = \sum_{i=0}^{2^p-1} \sum_{j=0}^{2^p-1} \sum_{a=0}^{2^q-1} |\overline{i, a}\rangle U_p^{ij}(j, a|. \quad (10)$$

By inspection, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{j, a}\rangle(i, a|\mathbb{P}_b &= \mathbb{P}'_b|\overline{j, a}\rangle(i, a|, \\ |\overline{j, a}\rangle(i, a|\overline{\mathbb{P}}_b &= \overline{\mathbb{P}}'_b|\overline{j, a}\rangle(i, a|, \quad p < b \leq r. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Using this and the representation (10), we readily find that the operator $\mathbb{U}_p$ and the EPOs $\{\mathbb{P}_a, \overline{\mathbb{P}}_a : p < a \leq r\}$ associated with the remote ESDs satisfy the relations

$$\mathbb{U}_p \mathbb{P}_a = \mathbb{P}'_a \mathbb{U}_p, \quad \mathbb{U}_p \overline{\mathbb{P}}_a = \overline{\mathbb{P}}'_a \mathbb{U}_p, \quad p < a \leq r. \quad (12)$$

To demonstrate that these are consistent with Einstein locality, consider an actual experiment involving such a transformation U_p . If $|\Psi\rangle$ is an initial labstate, i.e., before the action of U_p , then the final labstate is $|\Psi'\rangle = \mathbb{U}_p|\Psi\rangle$. Suppose the observer performs arbitrary partial observations on the remote ESDs *after* the action of U_p . Then for any

choice $\mathbb{P}_a \mathbb{P}_b \dots \overline{\mathbb{P}}_z$ of remote EPOs, we find

$$\begin{aligned} (\Psi' | \mathbb{P}'_a \mathbb{P}'_b \dots \overline{\mathbb{P}}'_z | \Psi') &= (\Psi | \mathbb{U}_p^+ \mathbb{P}'_a \mathbb{P}'_b \dots \overline{\mathbb{P}}'_z \mathbb{U}_p | \Psi) \\ &= (\Psi | \mathbb{U}_p^+ \mathbb{U}_p \mathbb{P}_a \mathbb{P}_b \dots \overline{\mathbb{P}}_z | \Psi) \\ &= (\Psi | \mathbb{P}_a \mathbb{P}_b \dots \overline{\mathbb{P}}_z | \Psi), \quad p < a, b, \dots, z \leq r, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

using the semi-unitarity condition $\mathbb{U}_p^+ \mathbb{U}_p = \mathbb{I}_r$, the identity operator for $\mathcal{R}^r$. These probabilities are obviously independent of the details of U_p , which proves that there is no way that measurements on the remote ESDs alone could detect any effects of the local operation U_p acting on the local ESDs. This is precisely what the principle of local causes requires.

A technical question remains about the evolution of the remote ESDs themselves. The above analysis assumed that the remote ESDs evolved unchanged during the action of U_p . This is equivalent to a *null* test on the remote ESDs, which would be unrealistic in practice. Therefore, the discussion should be extended to two or more independent local operations, one of which is the U_p discussed above and the other is some operation V_q on the remote qubits. As before, basis elements for $\mathcal{R}^r$ are written in the form $|i, a\rangle$, where $0 \leq i < 2^p$ and $0 \leq a < 2^q$, where $r = p + q$.

In the following we shall use the summation convention. Then the operator $\mathbb{U}_{p,q}$ for the combined simultaneous transformation is given by

$$\mathbb{U}_{p,q} = |\overline{i}, a\rangle U_p^{ij} V_q^{ab} \langle j, b|, \quad (14)$$

where the indices i, j are summed from 0 to $2^p - 1$ and a, b are summed from 0 to $2^q - 1$ and the coefficients satisfy the semi-unitarity conditions

$$[U_p^{ij}]^* U_p^{ik} = \delta_{jk}, \quad [V_q^{ab}]^* V_q^{ac} = \delta_{bc}. \quad (15)$$

Unlike the previous situation, all partial observations on either set of localized signal qubits are now affected by the transformation. However, how they are affected is still in accordance with Einstein locality, which is proven as follows. Using the summation convention, suppose $|\Psi\rangle = \Psi_{ia} |i, a\rangle$ is an initial normalized labstate and consider a set of partial observations on the first local set of ESDs represented by $(\Psi' | \mathbb{P}'_{i_1} \mathbb{P}'_{i_2} \dots \overline{\mathbb{P}}'_{i_k} | \Psi')$, where $1 \leq i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k \leq p$. Then

$$(\Psi' | \mathbb{P}'_{i_1} \mathbb{P}'_{i_2} \dots \overline{\mathbb{P}}'_{i_k} | \Psi') = [U_p^{mn}]^* U_p^{ij} [V_q^{cd}]^* V_q^{ab} \Psi_{nd}^* \Psi_{jb} (\overline{m}, \overline{c} | \mathbb{P}'_{i_1} \mathbb{P}'_{i_2} \dots \overline{\mathbb{P}}'_{i_k} | \overline{i}, \overline{a}). \quad (16)$$

By inspection, it can be seen that $(\overline{m}, \overline{c} | \mathbb{P}'_{i_1} \mathbb{P}'_{i_2} \dots \overline{\mathbb{P}}'_{i_k} | \overline{i}, \overline{a}) = (\overline{m}, 0 | \mathbb{P}'_{i_1} \mathbb{P}'_{i_2} \dots \overline{\mathbb{P}}'_{i_k} | \overline{i}, 0) \delta_{ac}$, from which we deduce

$$(\Psi' | \mathbb{P}'_{i_1} \mathbb{P}'_{i_2} \dots \overline{\mathbb{P}}'_{i_k} | \Psi') = [U_p^{mn}]^* U_p^{ij} \Psi_{nb}^* \Psi_{jb} (\overline{m}, 0 | \mathbb{P}'_{i_1} \mathbb{P}'_{i_2} \dots \overline{\mathbb{P}}'_{i_k} | \overline{i}, 0) \quad (17)$$

using the semi-unitarity conditions $[V_q^{ad}]^* V_q^{ab} = \delta_{bd}$. The right hand side of (17) is independent of any of the V_q^{ab} coefficients parametrizing the V_q transformation, which proves that Einstein locality holds for V_q . The same argument applies for U_p .

It is clear that this result generalizes immediately to apparatus of any rank and to arbitrary splits involving arbitrary localized transformations, provided none of these overlap as far as the ESDs involved are concerned. It should be clear also that this

formalism provides a basis for a discussion of lightcone and causal set structure in a QDN approach to relativity (the objective of future papers).

Two important conclusions can be drawn from this analysis: *i*) it is consistent to apply QM to parts of the universe, whilst ignoring the rest, even though all of it is subject to the laws of quantum mechanics [8] and *ii*) it is the possibility of isolating apparatus which gives rise to the SUO concept. From the QDN perspective, it is not that particles such as electrons and photons “exist”, but that apparatus behaves in such a way as to support that notion, *most of the time*.

6. Local spatial rotations

In this section we use the above results to prepare the ground for a discussion of EPR spin pairs and Bell inequalities. Consider an experiment involving an isolated Stern-Gerlach (S-G) apparatus $\Sigma(\mathbf{a})$, where $\mathbf{a}$ is the associated quantization axis, together with miscellaneous other equipment. $\mathcal{Q}^1$ and $\mathcal{Q}^2$ are the two signal qubits associated with the two outcomes of $\Sigma(\mathbf{a})$ (known conventionally as *spin-up* and *spin-down* respectively), and together constitute our local qubits. Signal qubits $\mathcal{Q}^3, \mathcal{Q}^4, \dots, \mathcal{Q}^r, r > 2$, represent the rest of the apparatus, which is considered remote.

Any S-G apparatus such as $\Sigma(\mathbf{a})$ is associated with a definite axis of quantization $\mathbf{a}$ in physical three-space and this axis can be altered by physically rotating the apparatus whilst doing nothing to the rest of the laboratory. Suppose the initial axis is given by the unit vector $\mathbf{k}$, which may be imagined to point in the conventional z -direction. Unprimed quantities will be associated with this orientation of the axis. Now consider a local operation $U(\mathbf{a})$ on $\Sigma(\mathbf{k})$, rotating its axis $\mathbf{k}$ into some new direction $\mathbf{a}$, such that $\Sigma(\mathbf{k}) \rightarrow \Sigma(\mathbf{a})$. Primed quantities will be associated with the new orientation $\mathbf{a}$ of the axis. There are four kind of basis labstate we need to consider, given by $|0, a\rangle$, $\mathbb{A}_1^+|0, a\rangle \equiv |1, a\rangle$, $\mathbb{A}_2^+|0, a\rangle \equiv |2, a\rangle$ and $\mathbb{A}_1^+\mathbb{A}_2^+|0, a\rangle \equiv |3, a\rangle$, where $0 \leq a < 2^q$ and $q = r - 2$. These are discussed in turn:

- i*) When isolated apparatus is in its void state, we would not normally expect it to generate signals spontaneously whilst the apparatus is being moved around in physical space. Hence we require rotations of S-G axes of magnetization to satisfy the condition

$$\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{a})|0, a\rangle = |\overline{0}, a\rangle, \quad 0 \leq a < 2^q. \quad (18)$$

This supposes that space is homogeneous and isotropic. We expect this condition to be broken in the presence of what would normally be regarded as a gravitational field. This is analogous to the phenomenon of *Rindler radiation*, or the spontaneous creation of particles in accelerated frames of reference, as discussed in conventional approaches to quantum physics in the presence of curved spacetime.

- ii*) $|1, a\rangle$ and $|2, a\rangle$ are labstates representing the *spin-up* and *spin-down* outcomes of the S-G sub-experiment respectively, relative to the current quantization axis.

Given that $U(\mathbf{a})$ is an active rotation of the quantization axis from $\mathbf{k}$ to $\mathbf{a}$, then experience with the SQM description of the S-G experiment leads us to write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{a})|1, a\rangle &= \alpha(\mathbf{a})|\overline{1}, a\rangle + \beta(\mathbf{a})|\overline{2}, a\rangle, \\ \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{a})|2, a\rangle &= \gamma(\mathbf{a})|\overline{1}, a\rangle + \delta(\mathbf{a})|\overline{2}, a\rangle, \quad 0 \leq a < 2^q, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the complex-valued coefficients $\alpha(\mathbf{a}), \beta(\mathbf{a}), \gamma(\mathbf{a})$ and $\delta(\mathbf{a})$ satisfy the semi-unitarity conditions

$$|\alpha(\mathbf{a})|^2 + |\beta(\mathbf{a})|^2 = |\gamma(\mathbf{a})|^2 + |\delta(\mathbf{a})|^2 = 1, \quad \alpha(\mathbf{a})^* \gamma(\mathbf{a}) = -\beta(\mathbf{a})^* \delta(\mathbf{a}). \quad (20)$$

iii) Labstates of the form $|3, a\rangle$ would not normally be encountered in conventional S-G experiments, due to charge conservation. Equivalently, a single photon entering a conventional beam-splitter would not split into a photon pair. Hence we are entitled to assume $\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{a})|3, a\rangle = |\overline{3}, a\rangle$, $0 \leq a < 2^q$, because any phase can always be absorbed by a suitable redefinition of the outcome basis elements.

Together, these conditions give the representation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{a}) = \sum_{a=0}^{2^q-1} [& |\overline{0}, a\rangle(0, a| + \{\alpha(\mathbf{a})|\overline{1}, a\rangle + \beta(\mathbf{a})|\overline{2}, a\rangle\}(1, a| \\ & + \{\gamma(\mathbf{a})|\overline{1}, a\rangle + \delta(\mathbf{a})|\overline{2}, a\rangle\}(2, a| + |\overline{3}, a\rangle(3, a|] \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

7. EPR spin-pair experiments

We now extend the discussion to spin-pair experiments, which have been used to explore issues in QM such as non-locality and violations of Bell-type inequalities. Consider an apparatus consisting of many ESDs, four of which are associated with a spin-zero bound state of two spin-half constituents, such as an electron and a positron. Suppose a quantization axis $\mathbf{k}$ is chosen, and let $\mathcal{Q}^1$ and $\mathcal{Q}^2$ represent the two spin polarization outcomes associated with constituent #1, whilst $\mathcal{Q}^3$ and $\mathcal{Q}^4$ represent those for constituent #2. It is traditional to describe such experiments in terms of a local observer *Alice* using S-G apparatus $\Sigma_A(\mathbf{k})$ to observe constituent #1 whilst a remote observer *Bob* uses S-G apparatus $\Sigma_B(\mathbf{k})$ to observe constituent #2. Other ESDs in the apparatus are isolated from those used by Alice and Bob and are represented by signal qubits $\mathcal{Q}^5, \mathcal{Q}^6, \dots, \mathcal{Q}^r$, where r is the current rank of the total apparatus.

Experience with spin-zero bound states in SQM leads us to take the initial labstate $|\Psi\rangle$ to have the form

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\{\mathbb{A}_1^+ \mathbb{A}_4^+ - \mathbb{A}_2^+ \mathbb{A}_3^+\}|\Phi\rangle. \quad (22)$$

Here $|\Phi\rangle$ is a normalized state in the total register $\mathcal{R}^r$ such that $\mathbb{P}_1|\Phi\rangle = \mathbb{P}_2|\Phi\rangle = \mathbb{P}_3|\Phi\rangle = \mathbb{P}_4|\Phi\rangle = 0$. Equivalently, $\overline{\mathbb{P}}_1|\Phi\rangle = \overline{\mathbb{P}}_2|\Phi\rangle = \overline{\mathbb{P}}_3|\Phi\rangle = \overline{\mathbb{P}}_4|\Phi\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$.

Before Alice and Bob perform any observations on their constituents, each rotates the magnetization axis of their respective S-G apparatus independently of the other. If Alice performs the rotation $\Sigma_A(\mathbf{k}) \rightarrow \Sigma_A(\mathbf{a})$ and Bob performs the rotation $\Sigma_B(\mathbf{k}) \rightarrow$

$\Sigma_B(\mathbf{b})$, where $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ are unit three-vectors, then the operator $\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ representing the combined transformation has the following action:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})\mathbb{A}_1^+\mathbb{A}_4^+|\Phi\rangle &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{a})\mathbb{A}_1'^+ + \beta(\mathbf{a})\mathbb{A}_2'^+\}\{\gamma(\mathbf{b})\mathbb{A}_3'^+ + \delta(\mathbf{b})\mathbb{A}_4'^+\}|\Phi'\rangle, \\ \mathbb{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})\mathbb{A}_2^+\mathbb{A}_3^+|\Phi\rangle &= \{\gamma(\mathbf{a})\mathbb{A}_1'^+ + \delta(\mathbf{a})\mathbb{A}_2'^+\}\{\alpha(\mathbf{b})\mathbb{A}_3'^+ + \beta(\mathbf{b})\mathbb{A}_4'^+\}|\Phi'\rangle.\end{aligned}\quad (23)$$

Hence the final state $|\Psi'\rangle$ on which Alice and Bob perform their measurements is

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi'\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \{ [\alpha(\mathbf{a})\gamma(\mathbf{b}) - \gamma(\mathbf{a})\alpha(\mathbf{b})]\mathbb{A}_1'^+\mathbb{A}_3'^+ + [\alpha(\mathbf{a})\delta(\mathbf{b}) - \gamma(\mathbf{a})\beta(\mathbf{b})]\mathbb{A}_1'^+\mathbb{A}_4'^+ + \\ &\quad [\beta(\mathbf{a})\gamma(\mathbf{b}) - \delta(\mathbf{a})\alpha(\mathbf{b})]\mathbb{A}_2'^+\mathbb{A}_3'^+ + [\beta(\mathbf{a})\delta(\mathbf{b}) - \delta(\mathbf{a})\beta(\mathbf{b})]\mathbb{A}_2'^+\mathbb{A}_4'^+ \} |\Phi'\rangle\end{aligned}\quad (24)$$

We are going to focus on one particular partial observation, $P(+\mathbf{a}, +\mathbf{b}|\Psi)$, which asks for the probability that Alice observes a signal in ESD_1 **and** Bob observes a signal in ESD_3 . In SQM this corresponds to each observer catching their respective constituent particle in its up state. From (24) we immediately read off the required amplitude, giving the probability

$$P(+\mathbf{a}, +\mathbf{b}|\Psi) \equiv (\Psi'|\mathbb{P}'_1\mathbb{P}'_3|\Psi') = \frac{1}{2}|\alpha(\mathbf{a})\gamma(\mathbf{b}) - \gamma(\mathbf{a})\alpha(\mathbf{b})|^2. \quad (25)$$

Wigner gave an intuitive calculation of a Bell-type inequality for such observations [9], arriving at the classical result

$$P(+\mathbf{a}, +\mathbf{b}|\Psi) + P(+\mathbf{b}, +\mathbf{c}|\Psi) \geq P(+\mathbf{a}, +\mathbf{c}|\Psi), \quad (26)$$

for any choice of three-vectors $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{c}$. In our terms, this means that the coefficients have to satisfy the constraint

$$|\alpha(\mathbf{a})\gamma(\mathbf{b}) - \gamma(\mathbf{a})\alpha(\mathbf{b})|^2 + |\alpha(\mathbf{b})\gamma(\mathbf{c}) - \gamma(\mathbf{b})\alpha(\mathbf{c})|^2 \geq |\alpha(\mathbf{a})\gamma(\mathbf{c}) - \gamma(\mathbf{a})\alpha(\mathbf{c})|^2, \quad (27)$$

in addition to the semi-unitarity conditions already in force. It is easy to find coefficients which violate this inequality. For example, following Wigner, we take $\alpha(\mathbf{a}) = \cos(\frac{1}{2}\theta_{\mathbf{a}})$, $\beta(\mathbf{a}) = \sin(\frac{1}{2}\theta_{\mathbf{a}})$, $\gamma(\mathbf{a}) = -\sin(\frac{1}{2}\theta_{\mathbf{a}})$ and $\delta(\mathbf{a}) = \cos(\frac{1}{2}\theta_{\mathbf{a}})$, where $\theta_{\mathbf{a}}$ is real, and similarly for the other two rotations. Then each set of rotation coefficients satisfies the semi-unitarity conditions and Wigner's inequality reduces to

$$\sin^2(\theta_{\mathbf{a}} - \theta_{\mathbf{b}}) + \sin^2(\theta_{\mathbf{b}} - \theta_{\mathbf{c}}) \geq \sin^2(\theta_{\mathbf{a}} - \theta_{\mathbf{c}}). \quad (28)$$

It is easy to find three angles for which this condition is violated, which demonstrates that QM is inconsistent with the sort of classical realism which led to the Bell inequality (26).

This result is consistent with Einstein locality because the partial observation used involves both Alice and Bob together, i.e., treats both as simultaneously local. On the other hand, partial observations involving $\mathcal{Q}^1$ and $\mathcal{Q}^2$ alone (i.e., by Alice alone), or involving $\mathcal{Q}^3$ and $\mathcal{Q}^4$ alone (i.e., by Bob alone), would be completely unaffected by whatever the other observer had done to the axis of their particular S-G apparatus.

8. Concluding remarks

The above results fully support the position taken by Heisenberg and Bohr: it is the experimental context alone which affects quantum outcome probabilities, both in the preparation of labstates and in how they are observed. Everything else is metaphysical speculation.

By showing that it is really the relationship between observers and apparatus rather than SUOs that matters in quantum physics, these results suggest that the status of quantum mechanics should be changed in a rather serious way. Instead of physical reality being regarded as some “quantized” version of a classical reality, quantum mechanics should be seen as no more and no less than the correct and universal set of rules for information exchange between observers and apparatus.

There are implications of this conclusion for various theoretical disciplines such as quantum gravity and quantum cosmology. In those fields, conventional approaches to quantization start by regarding space and/or the universe as some sort of quantized SUO. The Bohr-Heisenberg vision of reality, supported by QDN, suggests that those fields are ultimately doomed to failure *as they are currently formulated*, because quantum mechanics cannot be discussed properly without sensible notions of observers and apparatus, and such things could not have existed in proposed early universe scenarios.

References

- [1] Jaroszkiewicz G 2008 *Quantized detector networks: A review of recent developments*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B*, **22** (3) 123 – 188
- [2] Heisenberg W 1925 *Z. Physik A Hadrons and Nuclei* **33** (1) 879 – 893
- [3] Heisenberg W 1927 *Z. Physik* **43** 172 – 198
- [4] Zbinden H, Scarani V, Tittel W and Gisin N 2000 *Phys. Lett. A* **276** 1 – 7
- [5] Peres A 1993 *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer Academic Publishers)
- [6] Born M 1926 *Z. Physik* **38** 803 – 827
- [7] Jaroszkiewicz G 2008 *J. Phys.A. Math. Theor.* **41** 095301
- [8] Eakins J and Jaroszkiewicz G 2005 *A Quantum Computational Approach to the Quantum Universe in New Developments in Quantum Cosmology Research*, edited by A Reimer, volume 247 of *Horizons in World Physics*, chapter 1 1 – 51 (Nova Science Publishers, Inc. New York)
- [9] Wigner E P 1972 *Interpretation of quantum mechanics* Lectures reprinted in *Quantum Theory and Beyond* edited by J A Wheeler and W H Zurek (Princeton University Press, 1983)